

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-3, 5-27, 29-30, 32-33, 35-38, and 40-52 are pending in the application, with 1, 38 and 42 being the independent claims. By this Amendment, Applicants seek to amend claims 1, 6, 38, 40, and 42-43. Claims 4, 28, 31, 34, 36-37, 39, and 53-72 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter that would require further search and/or consideration, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Applicants also submit, along with the present Amendment and Reply, a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safetylogic, according to the articles below about Aon's Safetylogic. As noted above, claims 4, 28, 31, 34, and 39 have been cancelled, thus rendering their rejection moot. The articles are:

- A. Roberts' "New online tool target loss costs"
- B. Gjersen's "'Aonline' offers web serviced to RMs"

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all of the claimed features must be taught or suggested by the references and there must be some suggestion or

motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings, MPEP Section 2142.

Applicant respectfully submits that Safetylogic articles fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention. In particular, the Safetylogic articles fail to teach or suggest a method comprising, *inter alia*, performing an assessment of a site using the one or more site-specific assessment files, **the site-specific assessment files being configured to interactively prompt a user to (i) answer questions or (ii) perform one or more tasks**, as recited in claims 1, 38, and 42. These features are discussed, for example, in Applicants' specification, paragraph 0125.

For example, although the Safetylogic articles discuss several interactive features that enable a client to send email or attachments to a broker, Safetylogic fails to recite, teach, or suggest anything about site-specific assessment files being configured to interactively prompt a user to (i) answer questions or (ii) perform one or more tasks.

Even assuming *arguendo* that that one would be motivated to combine these references in the manner suggested by the Office Action, the present invention would not be obvious in view of such combinations. The suggested combinations would not result in the presently claimed invention reciting a method and system for performing an assessment of a site using the one or more site-specific assessment files, the site-specific assessment files being configured to interactively prompt a user to (i) answer questions or (ii) perform one or more tasks.

In view of the above arguments, it is clear that the present invention would not have been rendered obvious by the suggested combinations to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention. Therefore, claims 1, 38, and 42 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being patentable, either alone or in combination with the various articles about Aon's Safetylogic.

Claims 2-3 and 5-27, 29-30, 32-33, and 35-37 depend from claim 1, claims 40 and 41 depend from claim 38, and claims 43-52 depend from claim 42. Therefore, claims 2-3, 5-27, 29-30, 32-33, 35-37, 40, and 43-52 are allowable at least for the reasons claims 1, 38, and 42 are allowable, and for the specific features recited therein.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Theodore A. Wood
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 52,374

Date: January 17, 2008

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

708306_1.DOC